

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, SOUTHERN DIVISION

Mireyda Rebecca Miranda,  
Plaintiff,

v.

Steven Selinsky, an individual; David Galan, an individual; Stacey Galan, an individual; Angel Anderson, an individual; Collette Miller, an individual; Luxinvia, Inc. dba Monster Marketing, a California corporation; Fons Diviciarum LLC dba Monster Marketing, Google Ascent, and Top Pro SEO, a California Limited Liability Company; and Does 1-10,

Defendants.

Case No. 8:22-cv-00869-JVS-DFM  
Honorable James V. Selna  
Courtroom 10C

**ORDER ON ORDER TO SHOW  
CAUSE WHY A PRELIMINARY  
INJUNCTION SHOULD NOT  
ISSUE**

Judge: Hon. James V. Selna  
Date: May 20, 2022  
Time: 3:00 p.m.  
Crtrm.: C10

Action Filed: May 2, 2022  
Trial Date: Not Set,

On May 20, 2022, at 3:00 p.m. the Court held the hearing on its order that defendants Steven Selinsky, David Galan, Stacey Galan, Luxinvia, Inc. dba Monster Marketing (“Luxinvia”), and Diviciarum LLC dba Monster Marketing (“Diviciarum”) (collectively “Defendants”) show cause why a preliminary injunction should not issue enjoining Defendants, and their officers, agents, servants, employees, and attorneys, from: (1) further attempting to intercept, obtain,

1 use, or destroy plaintiff Mireyda Rebecca Miranda's ("Ms. Miranda") confidential  
2 electronic communications; (2) disclosing any of the illegally-obtained information  
3 Defendants have already improperly intercepted, accessed, obtained, and used in  
4 attempts to prevent her acceptance into a jail-diversion program, and otherwise  
5 thereafter; and (3) destroying any additional evidence relevant to this case.  
6 Defendants Steven Selinsky, David Galan, and Stacey Galan appeared at the  
7 hearing. Luxinvia and Diviciarum did not appear. David Grant, of Payne & Fears  
8 LLP, appeared on behalf of Ms. Miranda. After hearing from Ms. Miranda's  
9 counsel and defendants Steven Selinsky, David Galan, and Stacey Galan, the Court  
10 makes the following factual findings and orders.

11

12 For the reasons stated on the record at the hearing, the Court now enters this  
13 preliminary injunction.

14

15 Defendants and their officers, agents, servants, employees, and attorneys are:  
16 (1) enjoined from further violating 18 United States Code sections 1030(a), 2501,  
17 and 2701 and California Penal Code section 502; (2) ordered to preserve all  
18 electronic evidence relevant to this case; and (3) ordered to provide actual notice of  
19 this Order to their officers, agents, servants, employees, and attorneys under Rule  
20 65(d)(2)(B) of the Federal Rules of Civil procedure, and confirm the same, under  
21 oath, with Court.

22 Defendants are ordered to preserve in their unaltered state, and make no  
23 further use of, all computers, electronic devices, and electronic evidence implicated  
24 in this case—including, but without limitation, the computer identified in Exhibit  
25 "V" to Ms. Miranda's moving papers (and attached hereto as Exhibit "1") which  
26 appears to be housed in a cubicle numbered 6563—until the expiration of this  
27 preliminary injunction or a forensic examination of all computers and other  
28 electronic devices can be had.

1        The Court orders that defendants Luxinvia and Diviciarum provide actual  
2 notice of this preliminary injunction to all of their officers, agents, servants,  
3 employees, and attorneys under Rule 65(d)(2)(B). Defendants Luxinvia and  
4 Diviciarum are ordered to give a copy of this preliminary injunction to each of their  
5 current officers, agents, servants, employees, and attorneys, and any new officers,  
6 agents, servants, employees, and attorneys that may join or become affiliated with  
7 them while this preliminary injunction remains in place. Defendants shall file a  
8 declaration with the Court confirming that they have given each of their current  
9 officers, agents, servants, employees, and attorneys a copy of this preliminary  
10 injunction no later than two weeks from the entry of this Order.

11

12        The Court additionally finds that Ms. Miranda need not post a bond as there  
13 “is no realistic likelihood of harm to [Defendants] from enjoining [their] conduct.”  
14 *Jorgensen v. Cassiday*, 320 F.3d 906, 919 (9th Cir. 2003).

15

16

It is so ordered.

17

18

Dated: June 08, 2022

19

20

21

Respectfully submitted by:  
22 David A. Grant, Bar No. 288760  
dag@paynefears.com  
23 PAYNE & FEARS LLP  
Attorneys at Law  
24 4 Park Plaza, Suite 1100  
Irvine, California 92614  
25 Telephone: (949) 851-1100  
Facsimile: (949) 851-1212  
26 Attorneys for Plaintiff Mireyda Rebecca Miranda

27

28

Miranda v. Selinsky et al - Proposed Order on OSC re Preliminary Injunction 4885-4812-5729 v 1.docx



Hon. James V. Selna  
Judge, United States District Court